

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/044,684	11/09/2001	Robin P. Yergenson	10012411-1	9702	
7590 11/03/2004			EXAMINER		
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			FOX, CHA	FOX, CHARLES A	
Intellectual Property Administration					
P.O. Box 272400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			3652		

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/044,684	YERGENSON, ROBIN P.	. of			
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Charles A. Fox	3652				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet	vith the correspondence address -	-			
THE - Extending - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by signify received by the Office later than three months after the need patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. a reply within the statutory minimum of the rirod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC tatute, cause the application to become.	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communica ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133).	ition.			
Status			•				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	24 August 2004.					
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	drawn from consideration.					
Applicati	ion Papers						
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Example The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 November 2001</u> Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the oath or declaration is objected to by the	is/are: a) accepted or b) the drawing(s) be held in abeyonection is required if the drawing	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	` '			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Busee the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in priority documents have bee reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage				
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Inforr	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB r No(s)/Mail Date) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

Art Unit: 3652

Claim Objections

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: the newly added

limitation of the latching hub having a perimeter found in section (a) is in the wrong

section. This limitation should be placed in the claim after the latching hub has been

introduced into the claim, for example it should be placed in section (b) of the claim. In

the art rejection of this claim below the limitation is considered as being in section(b) as

outlined above. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United

Claims 1,3-8,10-13, and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Woodruff et al. In regards to claims 1 and 13 Woodruff et al. disclose an

object retention system on a rotatable carousel comprising:

a latching hub (34) with a vertical axis of rotation (36) and a perimeter (not

numbered);

at least one object (60) within the carousel, said object radially and outwardly

disposed in relation to said perimeter and having a latch reciprocal (172) for mating with

said hub;

Art Unit: 3652

at least one retainer (140) adjacent each object configured to maintain contact between the latch reciprocal and the latching hub.

In regards to claims 3 and 15 Woodruff et al. also disclose the latch reciprocal as being a prominence on the object and the latching hub has a depression (170) for receiving said prominence.

Regarding claims 4,5,16 and 17 Woodruff further discloses the retainer which form part of the latching hub is springable to permit insertion and removal of said object.

In regards to claims 6,7,18 and 19 Woodruff et al. further disclose the latching hub is substantially coextensive with the objects and that the latch reciprocal is mounted centrally between the ends of the object.

Regarding claim 8 Woodruff et al. disclose a method of securing objects in a rotatable carousel comprising the steps:

mounting a latching hub about the axis of rotation of the carousel;

providing a retainer within said carousel;

inserting an object having a larch reciprocal into the carousel;

mating the latch reciprocal with the hub such that the object is held outward of the perimeter of the hub;

wherein the retainer maintains contact between the latch reciprocal and the hub.

Regarding claim 10 Woodruff et al. also disclose the step of providing each latch reciprocal with a prominence and forming a depression in the hub to receive said prominence.

Application/Control Number: 10/044,684

Art Unit: 3652

In regards to claims 11 and 12 Woodruff et al. also disclose the step of inserting the object into the hub further comprises the steps:

the object displaces a retainer which forms part of the hub, permitting the latch reciprocal to partially bypass the hub;

the retainer returning to lock the latch reciprocal against the hub.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2,9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woodruff et al. as applied to claims 1,8 and 13 above, and further in view of Dodd et al. Woodruff et al. teaches the limitations of claim 1,8 and 13 as above, they do not teach a latch reciprocal prominence as being on the hub. Dodd et al. US 3,809,263 teach a rotatable carousel for retaining objects wherein said carousel and said objects both have latch reciprocals that consists of a prominence and a recess. As such they teach that the latch reciprocal may be either a prominence, a recess or both if desired. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to provide the device taught by Woodruff et al. with a prominence on the hub as taught by Dodd et al. in as an obvious design choice over the recess in the hub, said choice having the same expected results as the Woodruff et al. teaching.

Response to Amendment

Application/Control Number: 10/044,684

Art Unit: 3652

The amendment filed on June 18, 2004 have been entered into the record.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,8 and 13 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Charles A. Fox whose telephone number is 703-605-

4294. The examiner can normally be reached between 7:00-5:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Eileen D. Lillis can be reached at 703-308-3248. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CAF

CAF

10-21-04

EILEEN D. LILLIS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Calello

Page 5

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600